

47.20.56

A SHORT VIEW  
OF THE  
**Chief Points**  
IN  
**CONTROVERSY**  
Between the  
REFORMED CHURCHES  
And the  
**CHURCH of ROME.**

IN  
Two LETTERS to the Duke of *Bouillon*,  
upon his turning P A P I S T.

---

Written by the Reverend *PETER DU MOULIN*,  
Professor of Divinity in the University of *Sedan*.

---

*Newly translated out of the FRENCH Copy,*  
*which was never Printed.*

---

**LONDON**, Printed for *Benjamin Tooke*,  
at the Ship in *St. Pauls Church-Yard*  
1 6 8 0.



124'.03

---

To the Honourable  
Sir NORTON KNATCHBUL,  
Knight and Baronet.

Honourable Sir,

**T**Heſe Letters written  
fifty years ago to re-  
duce the Duke of  
Bouillon to the Proteſtant  
Religion which he had forſa-  
ken, never were put to the  
Preſs, for Fear of provo-  
king that great Lord to con-  
fute them with Arguments of  
Power, againſt which thoſe  
of Truth and Learning too of-  
ten

## The Epistle

*ten cannot stand. That they now come out in English, the Church of England is obliged, Sir, to you, who having by your diligent Search made your self Owner of a fair Manuscript of the same, were pleased to bestow it upon me, the Authors Son; adding your Request, which to me is a Command, that I would translate it into English, and give it to the Publick. I have now obeyed your Order, which I could not have done in a more seasonable Conjunction, and I cannot in Duty but return  
this*



## Dedictory.

*this Translation to the bountiful Giver of the Original. Sir, you have by your excellent Labours already publisht, shewn to the World how well you can match hearty Piety with eminent Learning. Now you are pleased to give another Instance of your Affection to both, by procuring the setting forth these following Treatises. Short indeed they are, but as compact with the Sinews of Reason and Learning, as any that ever came from the Study of that strong Champion of Gods Cause. May God be glorified by it, his*  
*Truth*

The Epistle &c.

*Truth asserted, his Opposers  
converted, and your Zeal for  
Gods Truth and Glory be re-  
warded by God, and imitated  
by men. So prayeth*

SIR,

Your true Honourer, and  
most humble Servant.

PETER DU MOULIN.

---

The

---

THE FIRST  
EPISTLE.

MY LORD,

**U**PON hearing the Report that you purpose to change your Religion, I continued a long time doubtful whether I should write to Your Grace about it. For, being hardly perswaded that such a thought could come into your mind, I was afraid to be offensive to Your Grace by my Mistrust. But now, seeing that Report to continue and increase, I could hold no longer from imparting my thoughts to Your Grace upon that Subject, being inferiour to none in Fidelity and Affection to your Service.

You were instructed, My Lord, from your Infancy, by an Excellent Father, and a Virtuous Mother, in a Religion,

ligion, of which you have learned to fear God, and serve him according to his Word. In that Religion, if you had met with some Scruple, you ought, at the least, to have heard both the Parties, and not have taken counsel onely of the Adversaries. This is plain tempting of God, who being thereby justly provoked, blindeth the Spirit of those that seek occasions to turn from his Service.

Had Your Grace done me that Honour to acquaint me with your Doubts, I might have easily shewed you, that the *Roman* Religion is altogether contrary to the Word of God. That they celebrate every day a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Redemption of Souls, other than the Death of our Lord Jesus Christ. That the Communion of the Cup, expressly commanded in Scripture, is denied to the Laity. That the People say Prayers to God which they do not understand, and the Publick Service is performed in a Language unknown to them, contrary to the express Prohibition of the Apostle. That the Trinity is represented in carved Stone and Picture, and the Adoration of  
Images

Images is enjoined by many Popes and new Councils, contrary to Gods expresse Prohibition in the Second Commandment; Which was taken away from the Law of God in the Offices and Breviaries, that the People might not see it. That Bones and Relicks of Saints are adored. That by the Doctrine of their Purgatory God is made to burn the Souls of his Children for Sins fully pardoned, and for which Jesus Christ hath wholly satisfied, and that not to mend the Sinners, but to satisfy his Justice. That the Pope, without any Authority from the Word of God, taketh upon him to be Successor to St. *Peter* in the Apostleship, and in the Primacy over the Universal Church. To defend which Primacy, Epistles and Decretals of the Antient Bishops of *Rome* were forged, and many Books and supposititious Passages, the falsehood whereof we shew by invincible Proofs.

In Decrees, Councils, Canons, and Principal Authors of the *Roman* Church, the Pope is called God, and the Divine Majesty, having all Power in Heaven and Earth: By which Pow-

er he fetcheth Souls out of Purgatory, puts such as he pleaseth in the List of the Saints by Canonizing them, giveth Pardons of Sins of two or three thousand years, giveth and taketh away Kingdoms, dispenseth with Oaths made unto God, dissolveth Marriages lawfully contracted, boasting that he cannot err in the Faith, and that he hath Power to add new Articles to the Creed, to be Judge above Scripture, and to alter that which God hath instituted in his Word. Of these I could bring to Your Grace a thousand Proofs, drawn from the Decrees and Councils of Popes, and from Publick Experience.

The Pope boasteth that he hath a Treasure in which he layeth up all the Overplus of the Penitential Works of the Saints, and distributeth them unto others by his Indulgences, and makes multitudes to travel two or three hundred Leagues to get the Remission of their Sins, which is offered to them at home *gratis* by the Doctrine of the Gospel. If a Rich man dieth, who hath given any thing to the Church, he hath many private Masses, Obits, and

and Suffrages for his Money. But never any private Mass is sung for a Beggar, or one that hath given nothing.

In the *Roman Church*, departed Saints are prayed to, of whom Holy Scripture saith, that they know not the Hearts of men, and whose Invocation hath neither Command nor Example, nor Promise in the Word of God.

I am told that Your Grace hath given ear to *Capucins*, who have for their Patron and Author of their Order St. *Francis*; whose Life, if you had read, as our Adversaries themselves have publish'd it, you might think that it was purposely written to defame him. There you may find how he preach'd unto Birds; that being stark naked, he embraced a Woman made of Snow to repress his Heats; that he took up again the Lice that fell down from his Garments, and many the like Feats. These *Capucins*, as other *Monks*, boast that they doe Works of *Supererogation*, that is, better and more perfect Works than God hath commanded in his Law; For which therefore they look for a

degree of Glory in Paradise above other Saints, who had attained to no greater Perfection than to fulfil the Law of God perfectly, who thereby have not got any greater Reward than Eternal Life.

If by the Doctrine of the *Roman Church* you are obliged to get Eternal Life by your Merits, instead of putting your whole trust in Gods Mercy, through Jesus Christ, you shall never enjoy any Peace of Conscience, seeing that the most righteous Persons have great Defects, and stand in need of Gods Pardon. Good works indeed are necessary to Salvation, not from any merit in them, but as the onely means prescribed by God to attain the the Kingdom of Heaven.

One of the great Diseases of the *Roman Church* is, that a Sinner, after he hath confess'd his Sins to a Priest, receiveth from him the Pardon of them : A Sinner forgiveth another Sinner Offences committed against God ; as if a Felon did forgive another Felon Crimes committed against the King. Thereby a man makes himself a Judge in Gods Cause. A Priest takes  
upon



upon him to be Judge of Sins which he knoweth not, for he knoweth not the Thoughts and the Affections of the Heart, in which Sin doth chiefly consist. Neither doth he know the truth of the Sinners Repentance, without which there is no Pardon. Indeed faithful Pastors have received of Christ the Power to remit Sins, as touching the Ecclesiastical Penalty and Censure of the Church, and to reconcile the Sinner excluded from the Communion, to the Church : But you would be much disappointed if you thought that the Pardon given you by a Priest doth exempt you from answering for your Actions before Gods Judgment Seat. For when the King forgives a Felon, he doth not exempt him from being judged by that great Judge.

Can a man that feareth God, and to whom God hath left some liberty of Judgement, read without horreur the *Canteles* and Rubricks of the Mass in the beginning of the Missal which the Priest hath upon the Altar? Whereby Provision is made against the inconveniencies that may happen to the Consecrated Host, when it happens

that Mice have gnawn the Mass-God, or when a Beast hath devoured it, or when the Wind hath carried it away, or when the Priest or a sick person hath vomited it. Can ye find in your heart to worship a God that may be stollen, or eaten by Beasts, or blown away by the Wind, and that being fallen cannot raise himself? How many times doth Scripture say, That Jesus Christ gave Bread to his Disciples, and that we break and eat Bread in the Lords Supper? That Bread is called the Body of Christ, as it is in remembrance of him. In the same manner, as in the next line the Cup is called the New Testament, because it is the Sign and the Memorial of it; Therefore the Apostles did not worship it. The *Roman* Church holds that Jesus Christ did communicate in the Holy Eucharist with his Disciples. All Parties agree that it follows from the Doctrine of that Church that Jesus Christ did eat himself, and had his Head and his Feet in his Mouth. The Gospel tells us, that in that Holy Action the Devil entred into *Judas*: Can ye believe that Jesus Christ and the Devil entred together into him? To

Luke 22.  
29, 30.

To strengthen these Errours, the sixth Chapter of St. *Johns* Gospel is impertinently alleged, in which the Lord Jesus speaks of *giving his Flesh to eat*; for Pope *Innocent* the III, and after him a multitude of Doctors have determined, that in that Chapter the Eucharist is not meant at all, and that these words of *giving his Flesh to eat*, must be understood of a Spiritual eating by Faith. There Jesus Christ speaks to the *Capernaïtes*, to whom he promiseth to give his Flesh for their meat, but he never gave them the Eucharist. He speaks to them of a manner of Eating necessary to Salvation, and without which none can be saved, saying, *Except ye eat the Flesh of* *John 6.*  
*the Son of man there is no Life in you. 53.*  
 Now many are saved without receiving the Eucharist, as the converted Thief, crucified with Christ, and *John* the Baptist, and many Martyrs. And Jesus Christ declareth, that by Eating and Drinking he understands Believing, when he saith, *He that cometh* *v. 35.*  
*to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.* Wherefore he warneth them, that *the words* *v. 63.*  
*which*

*which he said unto them, were Spirit and Life.*

It is acknowledged by all, that many Priests of the *Roman* Church are ill-Livers; yet it is the Doctrine of that Church, that a Priest, who hath been wallowing all Night in a Debauch, hath the power in the Morning to make a God with five words, and hath him in his power. I must also humbly beseech your Grace to consider, that the Council of *Trent* declareth it to be the Tenet of the *Roman* Church, generally believed, that Sacraments are Null if the Priest hath no Intention to Consecrate; which Intention is presumed but by Conjecture, and none can be certain of it, so that the People adore an Host not knowing whether it be consecrated, which is an Adoration at a venture. Neither can any in the *Roman* Church be certain whether he be baptized, for none knoweth the Intention of him that baptizeth, nor that of him that gave him Orders.

These things, my Lord, I touch summarily, of which the Proofs are easie, but too long for a Letter. To dis-

disguise these Truths unto Your Grace ; I am told, that you have been perswaded to read the *Invectives of Barklay*, in which Scripture is hardly alledged ; and *Gualtiers Chronicle*, which is but a web of false passages of some supposititious Books ( which are not received by the Learned of the *Roman Church* ) or Calumnies imputed unto us, and such things as we never thought on.

If, upon those false Passages and Calumnies Your Grace had been pleased to consult with some of our Side, expert in such Matters, they would have made you see evidently the falshood of them. The like I say of some passages of Fathers shewed unto Your Grace, most of them taken out of forged Writings, whose falshood is acknowledged by our Adversaries. We have Fathers only as they were copied out of Manuscripts that were found in Monasteries, written by *Monks*, who have falsified them, and whose false dealing is discovered by the diversity of the Copies, of which I could shew you many Instances, if I had the Honour to converse  
with

with Your Grace about that Subject. But God hath not permitted our Adversaries to bring to an end that Enterprize of corrupting all the Fathers; for numberless Passages are found in them which bear witness unto the Truth: For which the Doctors of the *Roman* Church blame them very often, and give them many ill words.

\* which  
the Rea-  
der shall  
find in the  
second  
Chapter  
of this  
Authors  
Anatomy  
of the  
Mafs.

But, because that Discourse might grow too to great a length, I do only refer Your Grace to a Paper by it self a \* Comparison of the Lords Supper with the Mafs, that you may know what horrible alteration was made in the Lords Institution, and that you may know that by going to Mafs you cannot be saved. You ( I say ) My Lord, who have been favoured with so many Blessings of God, who have had an Holy and Vertuous Education, and have a thousand Obligations to your Illustrious Lady Mother, whose days are likely now to be shortened with anguish and sorrow.

\* See last.

God hath given to Your Grace in this City \* a Faithful People, heartily devoted to your Service, which have built your Town, and fortified it with  
their

their hard Labour, and have not been sparing of their Lives and means to defend this State when it was in danger. They are a People whom God hath gathered from many places and sheltered under your shadow, committing them to your keeping. The Subsistence of this little State of yours, compassed about with Mighty States, depends, next to God, upon the Fidelity of the Inhabitants, and their Love to their Sovereign. Think you what Heart-breaking Sorrow it will be to that poor People, when they see Your Grace going to Mass. What Dissipation, what Desolation shall you see ere long in your City, when the Holy Scripture shall be banish'd from your House? when, instead of the pure Service of God, the Service of Images shall be established, Beads, *Agnus Dei's*, and sprinklings of Holy Water? When, instead of a Few Pastors, you shall have Herds of Fryars sowing Discord continually among your Subjects? When Ecclesiastical Goods shall be no more in your disposing, and the *Roman* Clergy must have again that which your Predecessors had justly

justly taken from them, whereby your Revenues shall suffer a great Diminution? When all the Ecclesiastical and Matrimonial Causes shall be no more under the Jurisdiction of your Officers, but must be tried at *Chalons* or *Rheims*, so that you shall be no more Master at home? When instead of Subjects, altogether depending upon your Authority, you shall have *Jesuits* and *Capucins* about you, having a strict Intelligence with those of *Bruxels*, whence Jealousies and Fears will arise greatly noisome to your State.

I could represent to Your Grace many Considerations to make you apprehend that by this Action you will ruin your Affairs, even in this World, and lose the Love of those that have been your principal Honour and Support, that hereby you will pull up the roots of your Reputation, Honour and Greatness, fill with Grief and Confusion your dearest Relations, and draw upon you the Contempt of Persons of both Religions. For even the greatest men of the *Roman Church* in *France*, that govern themselves by Humane Prudence, say, that you take your Mea-



Measures amiss, and cannot believe that ever you will take that Resolution.

But the worst consequence of it is, that thereby you will lose your Soul. For you have a great Account to give unto God, who knoweth the Hearts, who is just and terrible, and will not dally with those that dally with him. I have poured forth, and pour still for your Grace Prayers before God, & Sighs without number; neither am I without hope that God will be merciful unto you. One thing at least, My Lord, let me crave at your hands, that if you have any Scruples & Doubts about your Religion, you will be pleased to defer your final Resolution, till being come to this Town, you may hear the two Parties, and till we may speak to some Doctors of the *Roman* Church in your Presence. And I may be bold to promise to Your Grace to make you acknowledge that you have been possess'd with Calumnies against us, that both the Tenets of the *Roman* Church, and Ours, have been misrepresented to Your Grace, and that *Gaultiers* Passages are false and forged.

This,

This, if I cannot obtain of Your Grace by my most humble Request, yet so much comfort at least I shall have, that I have discharged my Conscience. But if I be so unfortunate as to lose your Grace's Favour for speaking the truth to you; it will be well for me that I have but few days to live in this World, which I will pass away in sorrow, tho' in hope to have them ended by Death, when it shall please God to receive me into his rest. And what Sorrow soever may exercise me in my Life, I will never leave praying for your Prosperity and Salvation, as resolved to be as long as I live,

My Lord,

Your Grace's

most humble, &c.

A SECOND  
 LETTER  
 OF  
 Dr. DU MOULIN  
 TO THE  
 DUKE of BOVILLON,

In Answer to a Letter of the Duke's to  
 his Sister *Mademoiselle de Bonillon*.

MY LORD,

**M** *Ademoiselle de Bonillon*, your  
 Sister, hath done me the  
 Honour to impart unto me  
 Your Grace's Letters to  
 her about the Causes that disquiet  
 your Conscience. Upon which, I hope  
 that your Goodness will not take it ill  
 that I make some Reflections, and try  
 whether God will make Use of me to  
 contribute something towards the Qui-  
 et of your Soul, and to turn you from  
 C the

the way which I see you take, contrary to the Doctrine of the Gospel.

You begin, by expressing your Design not to separate your self from my Lady Dutchess your Wife neither in this World nor in the other : Whereby you declare, that you had resolved to be of your Ladies Religion, before you knew whether it was good or evil, and that your Enquiries about Matters of Religion were made after you had formed that Design, and taken that Resolution. Concerning which I could say many things, but Respect stops me, being unwilling to be offensive to Your Grace.

You say next, that you have not sought the Grounds of the Religion of My Lady Dutchess any where but in the Holy Scripture. And yet in your whole Letter you allegde not any one Text of it.

You say next, that it is a point in controverſie which are the Holy Scriptures ; in which Question we have great Advantages : For the Books of *Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, &c.* are Books not extant in the *Hebrew*, which is the Original Tongue of the Scriptures  
of

of the *Old Testament*. Jesus Christ and his Apostles cite the Books of *Moses*, the *Psalms*, the *Prophets*, &c. but never cite any of those *Apocryphal* Books. The Jewish Church before Christs coming never did acknowledge those Books\*. And those Books are stuffed with Fables, as I have fully shewed in my Book against Cardinal *du Perron*. And whereas you appeal for the grounds of your Religion to the Fathers, we have for us the Council of *Laodicea*, *Melito*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Athanasius*, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Amphilochius*, *Epiphanius*, *Tertullian*, *Hierom*, *Ruffin*, *Hilary*, *Philastrius*, *Gregory I.* Bishop of *Rome*, and many more, all which to alledge might be tedious to your Grace : Yet, if you shall command it, I will send you a full List of them.

\* As we learn of *Josephus* and *Philo*.  
Book I.  
chap. 61.

*St. Austin* in this Point doth contradict himself; and the Third Council of *Carthage*, which is objected to us, is otherwise in the *Greek* Copies than in the *Latin*.

*Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*

You add, that there is a Controversie about the Interpretation of Scripture. The Pope and the *Roman* Church boast themselves to be the infallible Interpreters, and Sovereign Judges of the Sense of it. Yet the *Roman* Church never made any Interpretation of Scripture which was generally approved. We have onely Comments of Doctors, who disagree among themselves. Truly the Church of *Rome* intends not to make Scripture plainly understood, since she hides it from the People, and will not have it to be read, and hath forbidden the Translation of it into the vulgar Tongues. What Interpretation can we expect from the Pope, who boasteth that he can change the Commandments of God, and saith that Scripture is subject unto him?

Be pleased my Lord, especially to consider, whether it be just and reasonable that the Pope should be Judge in his own Cause, and whether the *Roman* Church can be the Sovereign Judge of her own Duty; and whether in this

Que-

Question, whether the *Roman Church* be a Sovereign Judge in points of Faith, the *Roman Church* her Self can be the Judge.

To give you some Instances of this, Jesus Christ saith to St. *Peter*, and to all his Apostles, *Whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven* &c. Upon which Text the *Roman* Prelate groundeth his Primacy. In Conscience is it just, that he should be acknowledged the Sovereign and infallible Judge and Interpreter of those Texts upon which he groundeth his Empire? For who can doubt but that he will give Judgment on his own side; as indeed by his Interpretations he hath laid up for himself greater Riches than that of the greatest Kings, and hath built to himself an earthly Empire. See then how he interprets that Text. Because Christ hath said, *Whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth*; the Pope pretends he may also loose those under the Earth, drawing Souls out of Purgatory. And whereas Jesus Christ in that Text speaks only of loosing Sinners, that are bound with Ecclesiastical Censures, the Pope from that Text as-

sumes unto himself the Power of loosing Subjects from the Obedience sworn unto their Princes, of dispensing with Oaths, of freeing Children from the Obedience due to their Fathers, and of dissolving Marriages lawfully contracted. And whereas Christ gave to all his Disciples that loosing Power, the Pope hath reserved unto himself many Cases, in which none but himself can give Absolution. Besides, he so interpreteth that Text, as if all that is said unto St. *Peter* was said unto the Pope, of which yet the Scripture saith nothing, and giveth to St. *Peter* no Successor in his Primacy or in his Apostleship.

1 Tim. 3.  
2, 3.

Your self, My Lord, may judge whether the Pope, who hath forbidden Marriage unto Bishops, can be a good Interpreter of the words of the Apostle, *A Bishop must be the Husband of one Wife, having his children subject in all gravity.* Whether the Pope having taken away the Cup of the Lords Supper from the Laity, can be a good Interpreter of these words of Christ, *Drink ye all of it.* Whether the Pope and the *Roman Church*, which by Canons



nons of Councils command the Adoration of Images, can be good Interpreters of the Second Commandment which forbids it. Whether the Pope, who makes Ordinances for publick Brothel-houses at *Rome*, can be a good Interpreter of Gods Commandement, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*. Whether the Pope, who forbids Flesh and other Meats, can be a good Interpreter of the Apostles Precept, *Whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for Conscience sake*. Whether the *Roman Church*, which in the Council of *Trent* defineth, that *Coveting* is no sin, be a good Interpreter of the Commandement, *Thou shalt not covet*. Whether the Pope, who brings into the publick Service a Language not understood by the People, can be a good Interpreter of the fourteenth Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, where it is so many times forbidden to pray and speak in the Church in an unknown Tongue. Whether Pope *John XXIII*, who denied the Immortality of the Soul, and for that Crime and many more was condemned by the Council of *Constance*, could have

been a good Interpreter of those Texts of Scripture which speak of Eternal Life.

For your part, My Lord, you take another course. For, without speaking of the Authority of the *Roman* Church, which acknowledgeth no Judge but the Pope, you say that you have found in the Fathers of the five first Centuries, the Religion which you seem resolved to embrace. Wherein you resist openly the *Roman* Church, which admitteth not the Fathers for her Judges, and condemn them very often of Errour, Ignorance, and Heresie.

Then you contradict the very Fathers, who in a thousand places refuse to be believed or received for Judges, and send the Reader continually to the Holy Scripture. Hardly shall you find many Texts of Scripture wherein the Fathers agree about the Interpretation. You may be pleased therefore to consider, that you undertake a Journey in a way where you see no Light. They are *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers which you never read, and where you can get no Information for your Judge-

Judgment. A man that hath nothing else to do, needs to spend ten years in study before he can get some mediocrity of knowledge in them; and the words which they use are taken now in a quite different sense. How can you know whether the Passages brought to you be faithfully alledged? How can you know whether the Books whence they are taken be not supposititious? Of which the Multitude is incredible. But after all, If the Verdict of the Fathers be received, the *Roman* Church must be cast, and it will appear that their Religion is but New. Since the *Roman* Church and the Pope boast that they can alter the Commandements of God, and make new Articles of Faith, even in that they have a new Religion.

Now you may ask, Who then shall be the Interpreter? Who can give us the true Sense of Scripture? I answer, that since the Question here is of an Interpreter that cannot err, and who shall always infallibly find out the true Sense? there is no such in being. God hath not in any place of his Word bestowed that Gift of  
In-

Infallible Interpretation upon the *Roman Church*, no more than upon the *Greek* or the *Syrian*. There is no need of such an Interpreter; for things necessary to Salvation are so clearly set down in Scripture, that they need no Interpretation. Must we have an Interpreter to know that God hath created the World, that we must love God with all our heart, that the Son of God is dead for us? Now, I say, that all the Points necessary to Salvation are to be found in Scripture, in terms as clear as these.

The Interpretations used by the Pastors of our Churches, are taken from the Scripture it self, so they are not the Interpreters; it is God that expounds himself. For Example; When they expound these words, *This is my Body*; they take the Interpretation from Jesus Christ himself, who saith, that it is a *Commemoration of him*, and from three Evangelists, who say with one accord, that Jesus Christ hath given Bread to his Disciples; and from the words of Christ, that he drunk the *Fruit of the Vine*, we expound his other words, *this is my Blood*. We ex-

expound also these words of Christ, *This is my Body*, from St. Pauls words, who (1 Cor. 11.) saith four times, that we eat Bread in the Lords Supper, and that we break Bread. Certainly, that Apostle giveth a clear Exposition of Christ's words, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood*, saying, (1 Cor. 10. 16.) *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?*

We alledge also those Texts that say, that Jesus Christ is no more in this World; that the Heaven doth contain him; that Christ is like unto us in all things, sin onely excepted; and that by consequent he hath not a Body dispersed in a Million of several places at once, and inclosed whole in every Crum of the Host, and in every Drop of the Chalice.

Likewise, when Jesus saith, *Do this in remembrance of me*; We expound not these words as the Council of Trent doth, which puts this Sense upon them, I do constitute you to be Priests, to sacrifice my Body really under

under the *species* of Bread and Wine, but we bring the Interpretation which *St. Paul* addeth (1 *Cor.* 11. 26.) *For as often as you eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lords Death.*

Consider also, that there is great Difference between a Judgment of Authority, and a Judgment of Discretion. With this last we judge of Meats by the Taste, without giving Laws to any. And it is so, that not only Pastours but also every one of the People, may and doth judge of the true Doctrine. And it is so that *St. Paul* will have the Corinthians to judge of his Doctrine (1 *Cor.* 10. 15.) *I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say.*

Of that matter and of the Interpretation of Scripture, I have written a Book purposely, which I have dedicated to your Grace, and which was presented to you by *Monsieur de Cabrilles* from me. I asked your Grace at *Liege*, whether you had received it. Your Answer was, that you knew not what was in it: for you have laboured to strengthen your self with Reasons against us, but would not take Notice how we answer them; and have conversed  
much

much with our Adversaries, but hid your self from your Servants, who might have cleared your Mind about their Objections, and armed you with Answers.

*Of the Condemnation of Hereticks.*

Your Grace saith farther, that you have desired to see whether the ancient Hereticks were condemned by Persons of our Religion, and whether one man be found in all Antiquity that had the same Religion as we, in all Points. These Condemnations of Hereticks were made by men sound in the Faith, that were of the same Religion as we in all points, who have condemned many Errours now received in the *Roman Church*.

The Council of *Laodicea* approved by many Universal Councils which were held since, rejecteth the Books of *Judith*, *Tobit*, *Maccabees*, and other Apochryphal Books.

The *Eliberin* Council held about the year of the Lord 305 hath made this Canon, *It is decreed, that there shall be no Picture in the Church, that the things that*  
are

*are adored (or served) be not painted upon Walls.* The Councils that have commanded the Adoration of Images are later by 4 or 5 hundred years.

In the first *Nicen* Council, the Marriage of the Pastors of the Church was approved, upon the Remonstrance of *Paphnutius*. Such is the fourth Canon of the Council of *Gangra*, *If any makes a Difference of a married Priest, as if he ought not to participate of the Oblation when he doth administer, let him be Anathema.*

This is the XXXV Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, *Christians must not forsake the Church of God, and go to serve Angels, and gather Congregations. If any then be found applying himself to that secret Idolatry, let him be Anathema, because he hath forsaken the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God.*

About the year of the Lord 399, a Council was held at *Carthage*, of which this is the 23 Canon; *When Service is made at the Altar, the Prayer must always be address't to the Father.* The present *Roman* Church contradicts that Canon, for in their Service they have Prayers address't unto Saints.

This



This is the 25 Canon of the same Council, *In the Divine Service, let nothing be offered, but the Body and Blood of the Lord, that is, Bread and Wine mingled with Water.*

The 16 Canon of the IV Council of Carthage, absolutely forbids swearing by the Creatures. To this the Catechism of the Council of Trent is contrary, which approveth swearing by Relicks.

The 10 Canon of that Council of Carthage saith, *Mulier baptizare non presumat*, Let not a Woman presume to baptize. The Practise of the Roman Church is contrary to that.

The Milenitan Council where St. Austin was present, and of which he hath made the Canons, forbids Appeals from Africk to Rome, in these Words, *It is declared, That if the Priests or other Clerks in such Causes, as they shall have, shall complain of the Judgment of their Bishops, the Bishops shall hear them: But he that will appeal beyond the Seas, let him not be admitted to the Communion by any living in Africk.*

In the VI Council of Carthage, there is a long Epistle of the Council, to  
Cele-

*Celestin* Bishop of *Rome*, who, by a new Usurpation, would draw to himself the Appeals of the Bishops of *Africk*; whereby the Fathers of the Council beseech him to receive no more Appeals from their Countrey, forbidding him to send any more of his Legats, or to use any more forged Canons to raise his Dignity, and bring Worldly Pride into the Church of Christ. Therefore *Baronius*, and *Belarmin*, and *Cotton*, Jesuits, condemn that Council.

In the Council of *Chalcedon*, held in the Year of the Lord 451, the Legats of the Bishop of *Rome* pretending to the Primacy, and bringing forth a forged Canon of *Nicea*, laboured to hinder the Bishop of *Constantinople* from being equal with the Bishop of *Rome*, against which, the Council made this Canon. *The Fathers, with good reason, have given Prerogatives to the See of Antient Rome, because she was the Imperial City. And the hundred and fifty Bishops of the first Council of Constantinople, moved with the like consideration, have attributed to the most holy See of New Rome, which is Constantinople, equal Pri-*

*Priviledges ; judging with good reason, that the City honoured with the Empire and the Senate, and which hath the same Prerogatives as the Antient Rome Imperial, ought to be magnified as much as [Rome] it self in Ecclesiastical things.*

The Popes of our time and their Advocates condemn that Council, not only because it equalleth the Bishop of *Constantinople* with that of *Rome*, but chiefly because it groundeth the pre-eminence of the Bishop of *Rome* upon the Dignity of the City, because *Rome* is the Capital City of the Empire, and not upon the Succession in the Apostleship of *St. Peter*. For the Fathers of that Council do not acknowledge him in that Quality.

The Council of *Aurange* condemneth the Merits in the 12th Canon, saying, *God loveth us, according as we shall be by his Grace, and not such as we shall be through our Merits.*

In the Year of our Lord 549, *Reparatus* Bishop of *Carthage* called a Synod, in which *Vigilius* Bishop of *Rome* was anathematized as an Heretick *Eutychian* : And *Honorius* Bishop of *Rome* was condemned by the VI and

D

the

the VII Universal Councils, as an Heretick *Monothelite*. In the VI Council of *Constantinople*, assembled again in the Palace of *Trulle*, in the 17 and the 77 Canon, the Church of *Rome* is expressly, and by name condemned, and is commanded to hinder no more the cohabitation of Priests with their Wives, and to Fast no more on the Lords Day, upon pain of Deposition, or Excommunication. Whence it appeareth by the way, that the *Greek* and *Eastern* Church, in which that Council was celebrated, was not subject to the *Roman* Church, since she prescribed Lawsto her.

In the Year 754, a Council composed of 338 Bishops, was held at *Constantinople*, in which it was decreed, that Images should be removed out of Churches, and the worship of them was forbidden. There also the Bread of the Eucharist is called the *Image*, and the *Figure* of the Body of Jesus Christ.

But in the Year 787 the Empress *Irene* assembled another Council against that Council at *Nicea*, in which Images were set up again, and the

the Worship of them was commanded upon Pain of *Anathema*. But in the year 794, the Emperour *Charler* the Great, caused that Council of *Nicea* to be condemned by another Council assembled at *Frankford*, although he knew, that Pope *Adrian* was of a contrary Opinion, and had defended that Council of *Nicea* by an express Book.

This is, My Lord, the Condemnation of Errours about our Controversies, which I find in the ancient Councils. Neither could I find any ancient Council, which (in matters of Faith) condemns the Doctrine that we profess. For the Chronicle of *Gaultier*, (which was shewed to your Grace,) representeth things falsely, and doth not agree with other Authors of his Religion, who justifie us against most of his Calumnies.

I am ready to undergo any Punishment, if in the 500 years, which your Grace mentions, one only man be found, that had a Religion any whit like the present Religion of the *Roman* Church. In the ancient Church the publick Service was celebrated in the

vulgar Tongue understood by the People. The Laity received the Communion in the two kinds. The reading of Scripture was not prohibited to the People. The Church did not believe *Purgatory*. Before the year 370 of the Lord, no Tract is found of Invocation of Saints. There was no Mention of *Roman* Indulgences, nor of the Treasure of the Church, in which the Pope hath laid up the Overplus of the penal Works, and Satisfactions of Saints and Monks, which he distributes among the People by his Indulgences. In those days they made no Images of God. They worshipped not the Images of Saints. They adored not the consecrated Host with Worship of *Latria*. They spake not of Accidents without a Subject. They believed not, that Mice could gnaw the Body of Christ, or that it could be blown away by the Wind, or stole or devoured by Beasts, as we are taught in the Beginning of the Missal.

In those days, the Bishops of *Asia*, *Africa*, *Ægypt*, *Grace*, &c. took no Oath of Allegiance to the *Roman* Bishop in their Ordination, and took no Letters

Letters of Investiture from him. In those Days they believed not that Jesus Christ had eaten his own Body in the Communion. They believed not, that it was in the Priests Power to create his Creator. The Pope did not style himself God and the Divine Majesty. He boasted not, that he could not err, and that he was the Sovereign Judge of Controversies. He drew no Souls out of *Purgatory*. He took not upon him the Power of adding to the Creed. He canonized no Saints. He gave no Pardons of two or three hundred years. He dispensed not with Vows and Oaths. He neither gave nor took away Kingdoms. He put no Kingdom in Interdict.

In those days, the Blessed Virgin *Mary* was not called the Queen of Heaven, and the Lady of the World. The Bishop of *Rome* did not bestow several Offices upon Saints, charging one to look over such a Country, another to such a Disease, another to such a Trade. They spake not in those days of *Franciscan Fryars*, nor of *Dominicans*, nor of *Capucins*, nor of *Jesuits*, nor of *Beads*, *Rosaries*, *Agnus Dei*, and the like

like Commodities. In a Word, the *Roman* Religion is a Religion spick and span new, and an horrible defacing of the ancient Religion taught by Christ and his Apostles.

If Your Grace hath such a great Desire to be instructed about Antiquity, you may desire one of those that take upon them to instruct you, to give you but one Example upon any of the forementioned Points. I am sure that they will never undertake it, it being utterly impossible.

I could shew to Your Grace, that all these Inventions were devised to serve the Gain and Ambition of the Pope and his Clergy. But I will pass to that which Your Grace addeth.

*Of the Pope's Primacy.*

From thence you pass to the Pope's Primacy, and speak thus ; I sought to be informed, whether all the Western Churches had not always acknowledged the Bishop of *Rome* to be the Primate and the Head of the visible Church, established by our Lord for the Conduct of the same; and seeing the  
the



the Protestants were so far from rejecting the first five Centuries, that they often both in their Sermons and Books, quote and produce the Fathers that writ in those Ages. I thought the shortest way for my Information would be to see what were the Sentiments of those Fathers in the controverted Points.

Truly my Lord, that short way which you say you have taken, is of an infinite Length, and indeed there is no end of it. It would have been a far shorter way to have asked of the ablest men of the *Roman* Church, whether it may be found in Gods Word, that God hath established the Pope Successor of St. *Peter* in his Apostleship, and in his Primacy over the Universal Church. They would have freely confessed unto you, that the Holy Scripture saith nothing of it, and that it is a Tradition about which we have no Commandment of God.

I observe also, that you speak only of the Western Churches, whence I gather, that he who suggested these things to your Grace, knows that the *Eastern* and the *African* Church never

acknowledged the Bishop of *Rome* in that Quality and Character. Now those Churches were then greater than the Western, as also they are ancient-er. Now by the Councils approved both by the Western and the Eastern Churches, which I have already al-  
 ledged to your Grace, the Pride of the Bishop of *Rome*, who began then to lift up himself is censured.

And though you had proved that the Western have always acknowledged the Pope as Head of the Church, it availeth nothing, unless it be proved also, that his Primacy then consisted in doing those things which he doth now. Did he then boast that he could not err? Did he vaunt himself as Sovereign Judge of the Sense and Interpretation of Scripture? Did he give Indulgences? Did he draw Souls out of *Purgatory*? Did he give and take away Kingdoms? Did he call himself God? Did he boast that he hath Power to add unto the Creed? For in vain do we dispute about Titles, when the things are different.

I would

I would also beseech your Grace to see whether you be not abused ; for indeed many Passages in the Fathers are found, which say that the Bishop of *Rome* is Successor to *St. Peter* : But they speak of the Succession in the Charge of Bishop of the City of *Rome*, not in the Apostleship, or in the Primacy over the Universal Church. And it is very remarkable, that all the Examples of the Popes Authority brought out of Antiquity, are within the Limits of the *Roman* Empire. And that it cannot be found for above a thousand years after our Saviours time, that the Bishops of *Rome* did intermeddle with the Affairs of Churches without the *Roman* Empire, as of the *Persian*, *Armenian*, and *Indian* Churches. In all that time he never gave them any Laws, he never received any Appeal from them.

And that you may see what was the Face of the ancient Church in that Point, I will lay down before your Grace some Examples according to the Order of the Ages.

For the first Age we find that *St. Peter* writ his last Epistle being near  
his

his Death, as he saith himself in the first Chapter; and then, or never it was time for him to say, now my Death is at Hand, but I leave you for my Successor the Bishop of *Rome*, to whom I will have the Universal Church be subject; but of that he saith nothing, nor takes any of those Titles upon him which the Pope now attributes unto himself. *St. Peter* being dead, if there had been any Question about choosing a Head for the Universal Church in his Room, no Doubt but that some Apostle as *St. James* or *St. John* must have succeeded him; for *St. John* outlived *St. Peter* about thirty years, but no such thing was done. In the same Age lived *Dionysius Areopagite*, to whom are ascribed by them of the *Roman* Church, the Books of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. Reason required that he should speak of the Sovereign Hierarch, who now is called the Pope. Yet he speaks never a word of him, he describeth all the Ecclesiastical Offices and Degrees, making no Mention of the Head of the Church, for he did not acknowledge any.

We

We find by the Ecclesiastical History, that in that Age and long after, the Bishop of *Rome*, was elected by the Suffrages of the Clegy of that Diocesan Church, with the Consent of their People ; An evident Proof that they believed not in those days, that the Bishop of *Rome* was Head of the Universal Church. For had he been so, the Universal Church must have contributed to his Election ; the People of *Rome* having no right to give a Head to the Church of all the World.

That Age did swarm with Heresies, which the Bishop of *Rome* did not condemn, nor had any Cognisance of them. None that we read of were condemned by any Council for not obeying the Bishop of *Rome*, and refusing to be judged by him. Our Adversaries themselves do not alledge any thing from the *Roman* Church of that Age, but only some false decretal Epistles of the Popes, which *Baronius* and *Bellarmino*, and *Binnius* and many others, acknowledge to be forged.

In

In the second Century our Adversaries find nothing for the Popes Primacy. Only towards the end of that Age, upon the Question about the Day of the Celebration of *Easter*, *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, separated himself from the Communion of diverse of the Oriental Churches, because they precisely observed the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the Moon of *March* for the day of *Easter*. For which Action, *Victor* was sharply taken up by other Bishops, and particularly by *Irenaeus*, as *Eusebins* witnesseth in the V Book, and 25 Chapter of his History.

The third Age affords us many Examples to the contrary. In the year of our Lord 217 *Agrippinus* Bishop of *Carthage* assembled a Council in *Africa*, in which it was resolved and defined, that the Baptism of Hereticks was no Baptism. This was against the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and whether of the two was in the Right it is not material; It is enough that thereby it appeareth, that the Church of *Africa* was not then subject to that of *Rome*.

In

In the year of our Lord 256 *Cyprian* Successor of *Agrippinus* began to defend his Predecessors Doctrine. There being then a Discord between *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* and one *Novatianus*, whereby the Church of *Rome* was in Trouble, *Cyprian* sent two Legats to *Rome*, to compose the Difference, thereby taking as much Authority over the Church of *Rome*, as the Church of *Rome* use to exercise in the like Cases. In all his Epistles to *Cornelius*, he giveth him no other Title but that of *Brother*, and acknowledgeth him not for his Superiour.

The Contention about rebaptizing of Hereticks grew hot between him, and *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, even to down-right ill Words. In the Epistle to *Pompeius*, which is the 74, *Cyprian* calls *Stephen* the Champion of Hereticks, proud, ignorant, imprudent, an Enemy to Christians, preferring Falshood before Truth, and Anti-Christ before Christ.

Moreover, he assembled a Council of 87 *African* Bishops, who condemned *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* and his Doctrine, and that in Terms worse than  
*Cyprian*

*Cyprian* had given him. About the same time St. *Firmilianus* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, a man of great Authority also, bitterly reviled *Stephen*. From these things it sufficiently appears, that these Bishops were far from thinking themselves subject to the Bishop of *Rome*.

In that Age our Adversaries find nothing for the Pope's Primacy; no Appeals to him from Churches, either far or near; no Laws given to the Universal Church; onely some forged Decretal Epistles of the Bishops of *Rome*, of those times are produced, whose falshood is acknowledged by the most Learned of the *Roman* Writers. In those Epistles the Pope is made to speak as a Master, having power over all the Emperours and Bishops of the World; Whereas the Bishops of *Rome* then confined the exercise of their Power to their own Diocess; not presuming to give Laws to any other Churches, much less to their Temporal Governours.

Of those three first Ages, Pope *Pius* the Second in his Epistle to *Martin Mayer*, which is the 188. speaks thus,  
Every



*Every one then lived for himself, and little Reverence was deferred to the Roman Church.*

In the year of our Lord 312. the Emperour *Constantine* being converted to the Christian Religion, appointed Judges in the *Donatists* Case, *Melchιάdes* Bishop of *Rome* being one of them. But the *Donatists* having complained of his Judgment, the Emperour commanded that their Cause should be judged again by the Synod of *Arles*, who had power to confirm or disannul the Judgment of *Melchιάdes*, and his Fellow-Judges.

Under that Emperour, the Christian Church being delivered from Persecutions, a new Order and Constitution was made over all the *Roman* Empire, to which *Sylvester* Bishop of *Rome* was not called. His Legend saith untruly, that he baptized *Constantine*, and healed him of a Leprosie; but upon that groundless Fable was built the *Donation of Constantine*, by which the Emperour is pretended to have given unto the Pope one half of his Empire.

The

The same Emperour, in the year 325. assembled a General Council out of the whole Empire, in which *Sylvester* did not preside, but *Hozius* Bishop of *Corduba* in *Spain*, of whom our Adversaries fallly say, that he presided in that Council as the Pope's Legate: A thing repugnant to the Testimony of *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, and *Sozomen*, and to the Acts of the *Nicene* Council, in which *Hozius* signed the first without styling himself the Pope's Legat; and after him *Vitus* and *Vincentius* Deputies of the Bishop of *Rome*.

To the Emperour *Constantine* succeeded his Son *Constantius*, who favouring the *Arrians*, banished *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome*, and gave him five hundred Crowns to maintain him in his Exile. But *Liberius*, to be restored to his Bishoprick, joyned with the *Arrians*, and subscribed their Confession, in their Assembly at *Sirminum*.

In the year 381. the Emperour *Theodosius* called a General Council at *Constantinople*, to which *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome* came not, nor sent any Legate to it; that Council being assembled

sembled without his consent. In that Council Heresies were condemned, and the Order of the Patriarchs was altered, without asking the Advice of *Damasus*. Yet that Council is one of the first four Oecumenical Councils.

About the same time, *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan* refused to administer the Communion to the Emperour *Theodosius*, for a Murther committed by his Guards at *Theffalonica*. *Ambrose* did this without taking the Advice of *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*, his Neighbour. Such an action in our dayes would be High Treason against the Pope. For it is one of the Fundamental Laws of the *Roman* Church, that Kings cannot be bound by Censures, or excommunicated but by the Pope's Order.

That I may not gather here a greater number of Examples, I have alledged before many Councils that have condemned Popes of Heresie, and have forbidden them to send Legates, and receive Appeals from Foreign Churches.

E

The

The first Bishop of *Rome* (that I read of) who took upon him to govern the Church as Successor of *St. Peter*, was *Leo* the First, about the year of our Lord 450. For before him the Preeminence which was claimed by the *Roman* Bishops, was grounded only upon some mistaken or falsified Canons of Councils; and those in Consideration of the dignity of the City, which was the chief City of the Empire: For out of the *Roman* Empire the Bishops of *Rome* claimed no Superiority.

Some Passages are found, true or false, in which the Bishops of *Rome* are styled the first Bishops of the whole World, and Presidents over the Universal Church: But the Reason of it was, that the Ancients called the *Roman* Emperours, Governours and Masters of the World, and it is frequent in their Writings to call the Empire *Orbis Romanus*, the *Roman* World. The Truth of this is evident, because the same Titles are many times given to the other Patriarchs, or chief Bishops of the *Roman* Empire, viz. To the Bishop of *Constantinople*, to him  
of

of *Antioch*, and to him of *Alexandria*, who are also called the Heads and Sovereigns of all; and are said to have the Care of all the Churches. Thus *Gregory Nazianzen* in his Oration upon *Athanasius* saith, *That the Charge of the People of Alexandria was committed unto him, which is as much as if one said the Government of all the World.* And in the same place he saith, that *Athanasius* gave *Laws* unto all the *World*.

*Basil* saith, that *Meletius* Bishop of *Antioch*, did preside over the whole Body <sup>*Basil. Ep: 50.*</sup> of the Church. *Theodoret* in his Book of Heresies, in the Chapter where he speaks of *Nestorius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, calls him also the Bishop *ὁικουμενός* of the whole habitable *World*. Wherefore also the Patriarch of *Constantinople* is called the Oecumenical or Universal Bishop in the Councils of that Age.

For this Rule was constituted among the Patriarchs of the *Roman Empire*, that each of them was to take Care of all the Churches of the whole *Roman Empire*: but that Power was never extended beyond the Limits of the *Roman Empire*. Yea, some Passa-

*Idem ep.*  
55.

*Sidon. lib.*  
6. ep. 1.

ges are found in which that general Dignity is attributed unto all Bishops that were eminent in Holiness; as *Basil* saith to *Ambrose*, that God had raised him to the Dignity of the Apostles.

And *Sidonius* calls *Lupus* Bishop of *Troyes*, the Bishop of Bishops, and the first Prelate of all the World. In those times all Bishops were called Popes.

For the Popes Primacy Your Grace alledgeth *St. Hierom*, who writing to *Damasus*, and acknowledging no other Preeminence than that of Jesus Christ, said, *I am in Communion with thy Beatitude*, that is, with *St. Peter's Chair*.

I see nothing there that favoureth the Popes Primacy over the Universal Church. For (as I mentioned before) the Bishops of *Rome* were held *St. Peter's* Successors in his Government over the *Roman Church*; which Government they held to have been founded by *St. Peter*, and I would not dispute about that. But they were not held Successors of *St. Peter's* Apostleship, nor of his Primacy. Saying to a man, I am of thy Communion, is not acknowledging him Head of the  
the

the Universal Church. So much may be said to any Bishop that is found in the Faith; yea, to any true Believer we may say, that we must be of his Communion, and that he that gathereth not with him, is a Scatterer. There were then held to be three Chairs of St. *Peter*, one at *Rome*, another in *Alexandria*, another in *Antioch*. The Bishops of these Cities styled themselves Successors of St. *Peter* in the Government of those Churches, not in the Apostleship. And there were always Piques and Quarrels between those three Sees. *Gregory* the First, Bishop of *Rome*, in the 37 Epistle of his VI Book, saith that those three Chairs are but one See, upon which three Bishops are sitting, and he acknowledgeth them his Equals, and that it belongs not to him to command them.

But they that shewed to Your Grace that Authority of St. *Hierom*, had more Wit than to shew you other Passages of his, in which he debaseth very much the Bishop of *Rome*, and giveth no good Character of the *Roman* Church of his Age. In his Epi-

file to Euagrius he saith; *In what part soever a man is a Bishop, whether it be at Rome, or at Agobio, whether at Constantinople or Regio, they have the same Dignity and Authority; Power and Wealth, or Meanness and Poverty, do not make one greater or lower than another. By their Place they are all Successors of the Apostles. And because some alledged the Example of the Roman Church for preferring the Deacon before the Priest, he answereth, Why dost thou alledge to me the Custom of one City? shewing that that was not to be a Rule to the Universal Church.*

His Custom is to call *Rome Babylon*, and the *Harlot*, and to exhort devout Persons to come out of her. And in his Preface upon the Book of *Didymus* of the Holy Ghost, he speaks thus, *When I was in Babylon, and was an Inhabitant of the Harlot clad in Purple, and lived after the Laws of the Roman Citizens, I would prate somewhat about the Holy Ghost, and dedicate my Work to the Bishop of the City. But behold that Pot which is seen in Jeremiah after the Staff on the North-side, begins to boyl, and the Senate of the Pharisees begins*



*gins to cry out*, meaning by the Senate of the Pharisees, the Ecclesiastical Roman Senate.

And in the Epistle to *Marcella* under the name of *Paula* and *Eustochium*, exhorting *Marcella* to come out of *Rome*, and to retire to *Bethlehem*, *I esteem* (saith he) *that this place of Bethlehem is holier than the Tarpeian Rock*, (meaning the Roman Capitol) *which having so often been struck with Lightning from Heaven, sheweth that it is displeasing unto God.* Read *St. Johns Revelation*, and see what is foretold of the *Harlot clad with Purple*, and of the *Blasphemy written on her forehead*, and of the *seven Mountains*, and of the *many Waters*; *fly from her my People*, and be not *Partaker of her Sins*, *lest you receive of her Plagues*: *It is fallen, it is fallen*; &c. But being gone from *Rome* into *Syria*, and living there in perpetual Quarrels with the Clergy of that Country, he was constrained to have Recourse unto his old Master *Damasus* (for he had been his Secretary) and to write to him those kind Letters which you alledge.

After *Hierom* you bring *St. Austin* in these words, *Shall we doubt whether we must rest in the Churches Lap, which by Succession hath always had Sovereign Authority in the Apostolick Chair?* That Passage is found in the Book *de utilitate credendi*, in the 17 Chapter, but otherwise set down than Your Grace alledgeth. Disputing against the *Manicheans*, with whom Scripture had no Authority, he useth humane and probable Proofs to exhort men to embrace the Christian Religion. He saith then, *We seeing such a great Assistance of God, and so great Proficiency & Improvement advance, shall we doubt to enter into the Lap of that Church, [not the Roman, but Catholick Church] which (even to the Confession of Mankind) from the Apostolick See, by the Successions of Bishops, while the Hereticks in vain barked about her, &c. hath arrived at the height of Authority [that is, to be the established Religion.]*

In this Passage *St. Austin* neither mentioneth nor appears to have thought of the *Roman Church*. And although the Chair of *Rome* had been named in it, yet this would avail nothing

thing for the Primacy of the Bishop of *Rome* over the Universal Church. For the Primacy of the Apostolick Chairs is attributed by the Ancients no less to the Church of *Alexandria*, of *Antioch*, of *Jerusalem*, &c. than to the Church of *Rome*. *Sozomen* speaks thus of the Council of Nice, *There met* *Soz. hist. lib. 1. c. 16.*  
*among the Bishops that held Apostolick Sees*, *Macarius Bishop of Jerusalem*, *Eustathius Bishop of Antioch upon the River Orontes*, and *Alexander near the Mareotid Marshes*. And again, of the *Ephesine Council*, *Cyrillus Prelate of the Apostolick See*, meaning *Jerusalem*. *idem 4. 24.*  
*Ruffinus* in the second Book, chap. 21. In *Alexandria Timothy*, in *Jerusalem John*, restored the Apostolick Sees. *Theodoret* in the fifth Book of his History chap. 9. calls *Antioch the most ancient Church and wholly Apostolick*. *St. Austin* in his 162 Epistle, speaks of the Apostolick Sees in the plural, saying, that *Cecilian might have reserved his Cause to the Judgment of the Apostolick Sees*. We have alledged *Basil* before, saying that *St. Ambrose Bishop of Milan* had the Apostolick Preheminence, and *Hierom* saying, that all Bishops are  
 Succes-

Successors of the Apostles. *Sidomius* in the first Epistle of the 6. Book, saith that *Lupus* Bishop of *Troyes* had already set nine times five years in the Apostolick See.

They do then abuse your Grace, that make you believe that *Austin* speaks only of the Apostolick See of the *Roman* Bishop, seeing that the Primacy of the Apostolick See, belonged to so many other Bishops. And though in that place St. *Austin* had spoken of the Bishop of *Rome* only, he had not thereby excluded the other Bishops from the same Dignity. He that saith the King of *France* enjoyeth the Royal Preeminence, doth not thereby deny to the Kings of *England* and *Spain* their Authority in their own Countries.

Here it is observable, that St. *Austin* was never subject to the Bishop of *Rome*, that he never took an Oath of Fidelity to him, that when he was admitted Bishop, he took no Letters of Investiture from him, and paid him no Annates for his Entry. He was one of those that made the Canons of the *Milevitan* Council, which forbade

bad the Appeals from *Africa* to *Rome*; and one of those that made that Remonstrance to *Celestin* Bishop of *Rome*, that he should for the time to come abstain from sending Legats into *Africa*, and meddling with their Busineses, and using Supposititious Canons to advance his Authority. The Bishops of *Africa* were of the same Faith with the Bishop of *Rome*, and spake to him in respectful Terms, because of the Dignity of the Imperial City, and because they believed that *St. Peter* died at *Rome*, and had founded that Chair among many others. But if the Bishops of *Rome* had taken upon them the Title of God, and boasted that they could not err; if they had taken upon them to canonize Saints, to give Indulgences, to draw Souls out of Purgatory, to alter the Commandments of God, and to add unto the Creed; those *African* Bishops would have bestowed their Censures upon him as freely as they did upon any other who fell into Heresie.

*Of*

*Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

For the Sacrifice of the Mass, Your Grace alledgeth two Passages out of *St. Austin*. The one saith, *That the Catholick Faith suffers not that the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord be offered for those that are not baptized.* In the other, speaking of his dead Mother, he saith, *that the Sacrifice of our Ransom was offered for her, when her Body was upon the Brink of the Grave.*

There is nothing more easie than to deceive one that will be deceived, and hath no Knowledge in the Fathers. *St. Austin* declareth his Mind upon this point very often, and tells us that the Eucharist is called the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*, because it is the Sign and Figure of his Body and Blood; and that the Signs are ordinarily called by the Names of the things which they represent. Thus in his *Epist. 23 to Boniface*, *Hath not Christ been once sacrificed in himself? And yet he is sacrificed unto the People in a sacred Sign; and*  
he

he doth not lye, who being asked, answer-  
eth, that he is sacrificed. For if the Sa-  
craments had not some Likeness to the  
things of which they are Sacraments, they  
could not be Sacraments. Now by Rea-  
son of that Likeness they take often the name  
of the very things.

Add to this the Canon, i. e. the *De consecr.*  
Roman Code of Canon Law. The *diff. 2.*  
*Immolation of the Flesh, which is done*  
*by the hands of the Priest is called the*  
*Passion, the Death, and the crucifying*  
*of Jesus Christ, not in Truth, but by a*  
*significant Mystery.* *cap. 48.*

This is then the Sense of these pla-  
ces of St. Austin, that the Eucharist is  
the Sacrifice of the same Price, because  
it is the Sign and the Sacrament of it,  
and because the Signs take commonly  
the name of the thing signified; as  
the same Father saith, *The signifying* *St. Aug.*  
*thing useth to take the name of the thing* *quest. 55.*  
*signified. And the Lord hath made no* *in Levit.*  
*Difficulty to say, This is my Body, when* *Idem con-*  
*he gave the Sign of his Body. And* *tra Adi-*  
*Theodoret expounding these words,* *mant. c. 12.*  
*This is my Body, saith, that the Lord hath* *Theod.*  
*given to the Sign the name of his Body.* *dialog. 1.*

And

Tertul.  
contr.  
Marc. 4.  
40.

And *Tertullian*, *This is my Body*, that is, *the Sign of my Body*. Indeed the Eucharist is called a *Sacrifice of our Ransom*, in the same manner, as in the Institution of the Sacrament, the Bread is called the Body of Christ; and in the same manner as the Cup is called the New Testament, because it is the Sacrament and Memorial of the same; for neither the Cup nor that which is in it is a Testament. *St. Austin* knew that Jesus Christ hath wholly paid our Ransom on the Cross, and that there is no other Ransom but the Death of Jesus Christ to redeem us: now the Eucharist is not the Death of Jesus Christ. And if to apply the Sacrifice of the Cross unto us, we must sacrifice Jesus Christ again; by the same Reason to apply the Death of Jesus Christ unto us, we must put him to Death again.

But what can we ask more, since our Adversaries confess that Jesus Christ did not offer himself in Sacrifice in the Eucharist, and put that Sacrifice among the unwritten Traditions? So much *Bellarmino* confesseth in the first Book of the Mass, *Chap. 27.*

§ *Quin-*



*s Quinta. The Oblation (saith he) which is made after the Consecration belongeth to the Integrity of the Sacrifice, but not to the Essence of it; which is proved, because the Lord did not make that Oblation nor the Sacrifice at the first. And both Baronius and the Jesuit Salmeron put the Mass and the Sacrifice of the same among the unwritten Traditions.*

As for the Passage you alledge out of the Catechisms of *Cyrill of Jerusalem*, I need say no more but that the Book which you quote is supposititious, whose Style is far different from that of the other beforegoing. God hath permitted that an evident Sign of Forgery should be in that Book; the Author exhorteth his Hearers, that they be no more Spectators of the Combats of Gladiators of the Amphitheater, and of the Horse-races in the Hippodrome: But since *Jerusalem* was Christian, there hath been no Spectacles in the Amphitheater or Hippodrome. *Gesner* in his *Bibliotheca* saith, that he hath seen those *Catechisms* in the Library of *Ausburg*, under the name of *John of Constantinople*.

Of

## Of the Invocation of Saints.

For the Invocation of Saints, Your Grace alledgeth St. Ambrose in the Book of Widows, where he saith, *That we must pray to the Angels that have the keeping of us, and to the Saints and Martyrs, of whom we may expect Assistance.* St. Ambrose writ that Book when he was a new Christian, but he changed his Language after that time: for in his Oration for Theodosius, written long after, he saith, *Thou alone, O Lord, must be called upon and prayed to.*

St. Ambr.  
l. 3. c. 12.  
de Sp.  
Sanct.

*And Mary was the Temple of God, but she was not God; wherefore we must worship God alone who wrought in that Temple.* And a little before, *We read, that we must not worship any but God, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

The Comment upon the Epistle to the Romans ascribed to Ambrose, upon the first Chapter saith, *Address is made to the King by Colonels and Governours, because the King is a man and knoweth not to whom he ought to commit*  
the

*the Administration of the State; but to get Gods Favour who is ignorant of nothing, (for he knoweth what men are deserving) there is no need of any ones Suffrage to help us, but of a devout Spirit. And upon Colos. i. Christ holds the Primacy in all things; wherefore if any beleive that he must have Devotion for some Element, or for some of the Angels and Powers, let him know that he is in an Error.*

*Chrysostom in his first Sermon of Penitence, speaks thus, God must be prayed to without an Intercessor. And upon Heb. i. in his third Homily, Why do you look up to Angels, gaping after them? They are Servants to the Son of God, sent to several places in your behalf. And in the eighteenth Homily upon the Epistle to the Romans, towards the end, To whom wilt thou have Recourse? Whose Help wilt thou implore? Wilt thou call upon Abraham? But he cannot hear thee. Wilt thou call upon those Virgins? But they will give thee none of their Oyl. Wilt thou call upon thy Father or thy Grand-father? but none of them, though never so holy, hath Power to alter that Judgment. These things being consider-*

ed, thou must venerate him, and pray to him alone, who hath Power to blot out that Obligation, and to put out that Flame.

S. Aug.  
Enchir. c. 3.

St. Austin saith, Of God alone we must ask the Good which we hope to do, or hope to obtain by our good Works. And in the Book of the Quantity of the Soul, 34 chap. God alone must be served by the Soul, for he alone is the Maker of it. And in the last Chapter of the Book of the true Religion. Let the Worship of dead men be none of our Religion; for if they have lived godly, they are not so disposed to seek such Honours: but they would have us worship him, by whose Illumination they rejoyce that we are Partners of their Dignity. We must therefore honour them by way of Imitation, and not worship them on the account of Religion. And he speaks thus to God, Whom can I find to reconcile me with thee? Must I address my self to Angels? By what Prayers? By what Sacraments? Many have tryed these ways, and are fallen to the Desire of curious Visions, and have deserved to be deceived.

Idem l.  
confess. c.  
42.

Tertullian in the thirtieth Chapter of his Apologetick, speaks thus, I cannot

not ask these things of any but him of whom I know that I shall obtain them. For it is he only that grants them, and I am he that have a Right to obtain them, being his Servant that call upon him alone.

Likewise Origen against Celsus, the eighth Book saith, Above all things, we must pray to none but God and his only Son. Ignatius who lived near the time of the Apostles, saith in the Epistle to the Philadelphians, You Virgins have none but Jesus Christ, and the Father of Jesus Christ in your Prayers. Clements Alexandrinus speaks thus, There being none but one only that is truly good, which is God, both we and the Angels pray to him alone. And so Athanasius. It is manifest (saith he) that the Patriarch Jacob in his Prayer joyned none with God, but him that is his Word; because it is he only, that manifesteth the Father unto us.

Cl. Alex.  
xand. l. i. c. 1.  
Strom.

Athan.  
Orat. 4.  
cont. Arian.

By a notorious Falshood, among the Works of this Father, was foisted a Book of the Mother of God, where she is called the Queen of Heaven, and Christians are commanded to adore her. But Bellarmine in his Book

of Ecclesiastical Writers, and *Banoni-  
us* in the year 48. § 19 & 20. ack-  
nowledges the Book to be supposititi-  
ous. By the like Forgery in St. *An-  
stin's* Book of the Spirit and the Soul,  
there is a Prayer to the Saints insert-  
ed, but in the same Book *Boetius* is  
quoted, who was not born when *An-  
gustine* dyed, an evident Proof that  
the book is falsely attributed to him.

There is a Book of the same Father,  
*Of the Care that must be had of the Dead*,  
which is truly his, but corrupted and  
falsified in many places: For he is made  
to speak of Prayers to Saints departed  
as good and laudable; yet he saith  
there, that the departed Saints know  
nothing of all that the Living do; and  
that if it were otherwise, his good and  
holy Mother would not have forsaken  
him. Then he addeth, *The Spirits  
of the deceased are in a place where they  
see nothing of all that is done, or that  
happeneth to men in this Life.* And a  
little after. *It must be acknowledged  
that the dead know not that which is done  
here, while it is a doing, but they know it  
afterwards by them that dye and come to  
them.* Was St. *Austin* so much overseen

as to teach that those must be called upon by us who understand us not, nor know what is done here below, unless some dye, and perhaps afterwards bring them News of it?

This Advantage we have in this point, that our Adversaries acknowledge, that there is no Commandment of God for the Invocation of Saints, and that the Holy Scripture saith nothing of it: And that under the Old Testament, that is, for the space of four thousand years, the Church used no Invocation of them. All the Prayers in Scripture are addressed unto God alone, and therefore we have no Assurance or Encouragement to call upon the Saints, which we can ground upon the Word of God. Is it not enough for us to have the Son of God for our Intercessor, who tells us, *None comes to the Father but by me, John 14.* For how can we pray with Faith and Assurance to those who discern not the Prayers of the Heart? For Scripture tells us that *God alone knoweth the Hearts of men. 2 Chron. 6. 30.*

I might say, that in the *Roman* Church many Saints are prayed to that never were in the World, and others whose Holiness is very dubious, and whose Lives were very bad. Three hundred and seventy years past in the Christian Church without any Invocation of Saints. The first that used it was *Gregory Nazianzen*, who yet invoking the Souls of *Constantius*, (who was an *Arian*) of *Athanasius*, and of *Basil*, added this Clause, *If thou understand me, and If the Dead have any Sense*: But the Invocation of Saints was not received till a long time after in the Publick Service.

All these things considered, My Lord, I cannot wonder enough that Your Grace chooseth rather to be ruled by one Passage of *St. Ambrose*, which perhaps is forged, than by the Word of God, and the Church of the first Ages after Christ. For would you subscribe to all that *St. Ambrose* saith? In the first book of Virgins he saith, that *the Angels fell by lying with Women*. In his Speech upon *Gratian* and *Valentinian*, and upon the first Psalm, he saith, that *some rise again sooner*



*sooner than others.* And in his Oration of the Faith of Resurrection, he makes three sorts of Resurrection; the first of the Patriarchs and Apostles, the second of the Gentiles converted to the Faith, the third of those that come from the South and the North. In his first Book of Offices *chap. 50.* he condemneth second Marriages. In the first Book of the Holy Ghost, he teacheth that the Baptism in the name of the Holy Ghost alone, without naming the Father and the Son, is valid. In the tenth Sermon upon the 118 *Psalme*, he saith that the Damned which are in Hell, shall in the end be saved, when the time of their Punishment is fulfilled.

The *Roman* Church believeth not with *Ambrose*, that all Saints shall be burnt with the material Fire of the day of Judgment, as we shall see hereafter. Neither doth the *Roman* Church believe with *Ambrose*, that *Melchisedek* was Jesus Christ himself. Many Pages might be filled with the like Errors of this Father, whose Authority you value more than that of God speaking in the Holy Scriptures.

*Of Prayer for the Dead, and of  
Purgatory.*

Your Grace endeth your Allegations of Fathers with *Theodoret* and *Austin*. The first of which is alledged to say, *We believe that there is a Fire of Purgatory, in which Souls are purged like Gold in the Furnace.* The other saith, *He that will not till his Field, shall be chastised in this World, and after his Death shall be punished in the Fire of Hell, or in that of Purgatory.* And addeth, that he hath made a whole Book of the Prayers for the Dead, and that the whole Antiquity hath so practised it.

They that have helped you with these Passages have miserably abused your Grace. It is true, that all the ancient Church prayed for the Dead, but in a manner which the *Roman* Church condemneth, and holds to be ridiculous and erroneous. Not one Passage can be found in the genuine Works of any Father, by which it can appear, that he prayed for the Dead, to draw them out of Purgatory.  
Could

Could Your Grace have the Patience to read St. *Austins* Book of the Care to be taken of the Dead, you would find that there is not one Word of Purgatory in the whole Book.

The Christian Church in the III and IV Ages after Christ, prayed for the Saints, for the Apostles, and Martyrs. The publick Form of those Prayers is found in the eighth Book of the Apostolick Constitutions of *Clement*, in the eighteenth Chapter. *We offer unto thee for all the Faithful which have been pleasing unto thee from the Beginning of the World, Patriarchs, Prophets, Righteous, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors.* The same is to be found in the Book of Ecclesiastick Hierarchy, that goes under the name of *Dionysius*; and in *Epiphanius*, where he treateth of the Heresie of *Arius*. All consent, that none can imagine that these Prayers for the Saints, were to draw them out of Purgatory.

St. *Austin* who writ in the Beginning of the fifth Century, was the first that said it was doing Injury to a Martyr to pray for him.

It

It further appears, that the ancient Church had not belief of this Doctrine, in that they prayed for the Souls that slept peaceably; which Prayer to this day remains in the *Roman Mass*, in which the Priest prayeth for the dead in these Words; *Remember Lord thy Servants and Handmaids which are gone before us with the Sign of Faith, and which are sleeping in a quiet Sleep.* It is evident, That this Prayer was made in a time when the Belief of Purgatory was not yet received, for those that are burning (perhaps for many Ages) in a Fire seven times hotter than Hell, do not sleep with a quiet Sleep.

If you ask me why they pray'd for the dead, whom they held not to be in any Torment, it will be no hard Matter to give you Satisfaction. First they asked that the Dead Person for whom they pray'd might rise again to Salvation in the last day. Such was the Prayer of *Judas Maccabæus*, 2 *Mac.* 12. *Doing therein* (saith the Author) *very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the Resurrection.* For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should

*should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the Dead.*

By the Judgment of that Author, the Prayer made for the dead in the *Roman Church*, is superfluous and vain, since it is not made for their Resurrection. That this was in old time the intent of the *Roman Church* when they pray'd for the Dead, it appeareth by the Prayers which are used still in the Mass for the Dead, of which these are the Words; *We beseech thee Lord to absolve the Souls of thy Servants from all Bonds of Sin, that in the Glory of the Resurrection, being risen again, they may breath among the elected Saints.* Thus *Ambrose* prayeth for the Soul of *Theodosius*, and yet he saith, that he is received into Christ's Tabernacles in the heavenly *Jerusalem*. And *St. Austin* prayeth for the Soul of his Mother *Monica*, which is among the Saints, and whom *St. Austin* believes to be enjoying heavenly Blessedness.

Another Opinion was rise among the Antients, That some Souls should rise sooner than other Souls, and that many Sins were to be expiated by the Delay of the Resurrection. *Tertullian*

*an* towards the end of his Book of the Soul, makes the Suffering of Souls after Death, even for the least Sins to consist in that Delay. In the Book of *Monogamy*, chap. 10. he will have a Widow to pray for her deceased Husband, and that she may keep him Company in the first Resurrection. The like Prayer *Ambrose* maketh for *Gratian* and *Valentinian*, *I beseech thee O Supreme God, that thou wilt raise up again, more early, these most beloved young men.* Here is then a second end, for which the Ancients prayed for the dead.

They had one end more. It was an Opinion generally held by the Fathers, that in the day of Judgment, after men are risen again they shall not enter into Paradise before they have been singed and purged by the Fire of the day of Judgment, some more, some less, as they have more or less sinned. This is the Purgatory Fire of the Antients, of which their Books are full. Through that fire they make all the Saints to pass, even the Virgin *Mary*. *Lactantius lib. 7. cap. 21.* declares thus his Opinion, which was then the general, *When God hath judged the Just, he will try them by fire, and those*

those whose Sins are very considerable either in Weight or number, shall be singed and lightly burnt by the Fire. Thus Hilary upon St. Matthew, To them that are baptized with Holy Ghost, it remains yet to be perfected by the fire of Judgment.

Hilar. in  
Mat. Ca-  
non. 2.

And in the part Gimel upon the 119 Psalm, This Purification is reserved for us after the Baptism of Water, which must sanctifie us by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and refine us by the Fire of Judgment?

Again, Do we wish for the day of Judgment, in which we must pass through that unwearied Fire, and undergo those grievous Pains, to expiate the Soul of her Sins? And he makes the Virgin Mary go through that Fire, If (saith he) even that Virgin which hath conceived God must undergo the Severity of that Judgment, who will dare to desire to be judged by God?

St. Ambrose also saith, that all the Prophets and Apostles must in that day be purged by that Fire. In the 20 Sermon upon the 118 Psal. All must pass through the Flames, even John the Evangelist, whom the Lord loved, even Peter. And upon the 36 Psal. The Sons of Levi shall be purged by Fire, Ezekiel, Daniel,

&c.

*Ec.* Observe that he saith, *they shall be*; whence it appears, that he speaks of a Fire which is not yet. *St. Austin* is exprefs for it in the 16 Book of the City of God, chap. 24. *By this Fire is understood the day of Judgment, which shall separate the Carnal, some to be saved by the Fire, some to be condemned to the Fire.* And in the 25 Chap. of the 20 Book, *By that which was said it seems to be evident, that in that Judgment there will be some Purgatory Pains*; And the Title of the chapter saith exprefly, that he speaks of the Fire of the last Judgment. After the Purgation by that Fire, he holds that the Sentence of the last Judgment shall be pronounced, in the 21 Book chap. 16.

Of that Purgation by Fire speak *Irenaeus, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, and Hierom.* It is of that Fire, My Lord, that *Theodore*t and *Austin* speak in the places which you alledge. And it is one of the grounds, why the Ancients prayed for the dead. For that *St. Austin* believed that Souls going out of the Body, went streight either into Paradise or into Hell, and that there is no middle or third place called



ed Purgatory: it is clear by these Passages, in the 18 Sermon of the words of the Apostle, *There are two Habitations, the one of the eternal Kingdom, the other of the eternal Fire.* And in the 232 Sermon, which is against Drunkenness. *Let none deceive himself, my Brethren, for there are two places and no third. He that hath not merited with Christ, shall perish without doubt with the Devil.* And in the first Book of the merit of Sins and of Pardon, ch. 28. *There is no middle place, so that he that diselleth not with Christ, can be any where else than with the Devil.* The fifth Book of the Hypognosticks speaks thus, *The Catholick Faith grounded upon Divine Authority, is, that the first place is the Kingdom of Heaven, and the second is Hell. We believe no third place, and find none in the holy Scriptures.* In the Book of the Vanity of the World, chap. 1. *Know ye that when the Soul separates from the Body, it is at the same Instant placed in Paradise for its good Works, or cast down into the Gulf of Hell for its Sins.*

I could bring Your Grace Passages by hundreds out of the Fathers, which express that the Souls of the godly are pre-

presently after Death carried into Paradise or into Hell. I will content myself with one or two.

*Cyprian* in the Book against *Demetrian* speaks thus, *This temporal Life being ended, we are sequestred either in the Habitation of Death, or in that of eternal Life. And in the same place, When men are gone from hence, there is no place left for Penitence, no Fruit, no effect of Satisfaction, and in Death it self they pass to Immortality.*

The Fathers were so far from believing that Souls were burnt in Purgatory, that many of them believed not that the Souls could be tormented without the Bodies. Thus *Tertullian* in the 48 Chap. of his *Apologetick*, *The Soul (saith he) cannot suffer without solid Matter, that is, without Flesh* And *Gregory* in the Oration of the Lords Resurrection, *The Fire can never work upon the separate Soul, and Darkness cannot be grievous to it, because it hath no Eyes.* *Ambrose* in the first book of Penitence Chap. 17. *The Soul without the Body, and the Body without the Soul, cannot be Partakers of Punishment or Reward.*

*Chry-*

*Chrysostom* in the 39 Homily upon the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. *The Soul without the Flesh shall not receive her hidden Goods, as likewise she shall not be punisht without the Flesh.*

The Truth is so strong on our side, that many of our Adversaries freely confess that the Fathers speak little or not at all of Purgatory. *Navarrus* the Popes Penitentiary, in the beginning of the year of *Jubile*, saith, *No Orthodox doubteth that there is a Purgatory. Yet the Ancients make no mention of it, or very seldom, and that he saith after Rossensis, otherwise the Cardinal of Rochester, whom he alledgeth.*

*Alphonsus de Castro* one of the Doctors of the Council of *Trent*, in his eighth Book against Heresies, upon the Word *Indulgentia*, speaks thus. *In the ancient Writers, the mention of the Transubstantiation of the Body of Christ is very rare, of the Procession of the Holy Ghost more rare yet, of the Purgatory they make almost no mention at all, especially the Greek Authors; as also to this day the Greeks have not believed Purgatory.*

One may see in the Dialogues of *Gregory the First*, That *Satan* in his

G

time

time was brewing that Myſtery by Viſions and Apparitions of Souls, ſome of which ſaid that they purged themſelves at the Smoak of Baths, others in the Wind, others in Rivers; and this was already in the year of our Lord 595.

But the Popes that came after, found out another kind of Purgatory wonderfully gainful, whereby they have heaped up to themſelves and their Clergy infinite Riches. For the Pope by Bulls and Indulgences fetcheth Souls out of Purgatory at the Suit of thoſe that will come to his Price to buy them, and particular Maſſes, whoſe number is infinite, are bought very dear, and none of them is ſung with particular Application to beggers or thoſe that have given nothing.

Yet they hold one Age to be exempted from Purgatory, for (ſay they) when Jeſus Chriſt cometh to judge the World, then all that live in the World ſhall be exempted from that Torment. In the mean while, one may wonder that whiſt Jeſus Chriſt is interceding for the Souls that are burning in that Fire (for he intercedeth for all the faithful) thoſe  
Souls

Souls come not out by this Intercession, but by the Popes Indulgence.

By all that has been said here, Your Grace may perceive how much you are mistaken in the Fathers, and indeed, by your manner of alledging them, it is easie to see that you have not read them; but that some ignorant men furnish you with Passages, which have quite another Sense than that which they put upon them. If forsaking what you know from the holy Scripture, which (as *St. Paul* saith) is able to make us wise unto Salvation, you take those things upon Trust which others tell you out of the Fathers, and if you greedily embrace all that shall be presented unto you of this kind, you will find enough to help your Resolution, not to be separated neither in this World, nor in the other, from my Lady, your Dutcheſs. You say that you would know the Grounds of her Religion, whilst her Grace did not trouble her self to know the Grounds of yours.

My Lord, how could that Thought come into your Mind, to believe Purgatory upon two or three Passages

of Fathers distorted from their right Sense, and to shut your Eyes against all that the Word of God speaks against it? Out of that good Word you might have learned, that *Blessed are they that dye in the Lord, that they rest from their Labours, and that their Works follow them; that when the righteous dyeth he shall enter into Peace: that we must make to our selves Friends by Alms, which when we fail, may receive us into everlasting Habitations.* That Jesus Christ said to the repenting Thief crucified with him, *This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.* And yet by the Doctrine of the Roman Church, he had need of great Purgation. *That the Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God, cleanseth us from all Sin.* This is our true Purgatory, God who is all just and all good, would he take two Payments for the same Debt, when the first Payment which is the death of Christ is sufficient? would he delight to torment his Children for many Ages in an internal fire, for Sins which he hath freely pardoned, as we learn of St. Paul, that *God for Christs sake hath forgiven us all our Trespases?*

Every

Every Father that chastiseth his Children, unless he be altogether unnatural, doth it to make them better ; but the *Roman Church* will have God to burn his Children, not to make them more righteous (for by their Doctrine they are perfectly righteous before they enter into Purgatory) but to content himself, and satisfie his Justice. Let them find if they can, one example in Scripture of any Soul that was sent to Purgatory.

It is very considerable that in the Levitical Law there are Sacrifices prescribed for all sorts of Sin and Pollution, even of Leprosie and the touching of a dead body; but that Law prescribes no Sacrifice for the dead, nor any Service for their Relief, yea, it opposeth it plainly; for he that brought unto the Temple or Sanctuary his first Fruits, Tithes and Offerings, to give Thanks unto God for his Income, and all the Crop of the Year, was commanded to protest that he *had not taken away ought thereof for any unclean use, nor given ought thereof for the dead.* *Deut. 26. 12, & 14.*

All these things, My Lord, drawn out of the Word of God, and founded upon

upon the Nature of the Gospel, which the Son of God hath brought you from Heaven, are they not better than some Passages of the Fathers, which you alledge contrary to their Intention, and which say things that the *Roman* Church approveth not.

How comes it to pass, My Lord, that since your Marriage you have taken another Rule for your Religion than the Word of God? You will be guided by the Fathers; but the Fathers send you back to the Scripture, and will not have you to rest upon their Authority, acknowledging that they themselves are subject to Errour. And for such the *Roman* Church doth acknowledge them, and in a thousand things find fault with them. Certainly the Holy Scripture without the help of mens Glosses hath light enough of its own to lead us to Salvation.

O! My Lord, it is dangerous to dally with God; and to bow the rule of his Word to the Will of another. As for My Lady Duchess your wife, I wonder not, that being nursed in that Persuasion that her Religion is good, she doth her utmost to draw you to it,  
think-



thinking thereby to do Service to God. Having no Instruction in the Word of God, her Grace doth that which she thinks to be good ; and I hope that God finally will be merciful to her. But you, My Lord, who have been carefully instructed in the Word of God, in whose Family God had planted his Covenant, whom God hath blest with so many effects of his Assistance, cannot but have a dreadful Account to give unto God.

I could alledge to Your Grace the memory of my Lord your Father, whom God had endowed with an incomparable Capacity ; the Sorrow of your Lady Mother, whose Death you hasten by your Change ; the Anguish of your nearest Relations, and of all your Servants and Subjects, whom you fill with Confusion ; and the Inconvenience to your Affairs, which you do your self acknowledge. I choose rather to exhort your Grace in the name of God, and as your most humble and faithful Servant, that you take pitty of your own Soul ; and that at least you delay the taking of that final Resolution, till your Return unto this your Town, and till I may endeavour to shew to those Doctors

ctors in your Presence, that they abuse your Grace with those Passages of the Fathers, wherewith they have armed you. But I am sure they dare not appear before me to maintain those things which they infuse into your mind. You have been many years harkning to them alone, without asking any of our Counsel or Assistance. Grant us at least, that we may have some days to answer them.

I make no Doubt, but that by speaking thus, I may loose both your Graces and your Ladies Favour. But having but few days to live, I commit to God all that may come of it, and will endeavour to discharge my duty with a good Conscience. Which I will always do without any Diminution of the Respect and Obedience which I owe to your Grace, and without intermitting my continual prayers to God for Your Grace, and for my Lady Dutcheſs, as being,

My Lord,

*Your Graces most humble  
and most obedient Servant.*

PETER DU MOULIN.

F I N I S.

7  
s  
e  
t  
e  
r  
-  
-  
e.  
e  
-  
-  
-  
o  
ll  
h  
-  
of  
I  
r-  
d  
y

4.